Serial Number
09/636,393   PU050092

Remarks

Claims 1-12, 14-15, 18-50 are pending.
Claims 1-12, 14-15, and 18-50 are rejected.

Claim 1 is amended is to recite that content is not permitted to be sent if
the content provider is unauthorized.

Claim 2 is amended to recite the case of what happens if a content provider
is unauthorized, where a user request is rerouted to an authorized content
provider.

Claim 4 is amended apparently to fix an apparently error in the claim, from
being an authorized content provider to being an unauthorized content provider.

Claim 8 is amended to incorporate elements of cancelled dependent
Claims 13, 16, and 17.

Claims 28 and 42 are amended to incorporate the concepts of authorized
and unauthorized content providers.

No new matter was added in view of these amendments.

I. 35 U.S.C. 102(e) Rejection of Claims 1-50

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-50 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being
anticipated in view of Ben-Shaul et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0010798,
which issued as US patent 6,976,090, hereafter referred to as 'Ben-Shaul').
Applicants disagree with this ground of rejection.

A. Rejection of Claim 1

Claim 1 claims an element of a third party operating where the third party
permits "permitting the enhanced content programming to be provided to the
receiver over the network in response to the user request only if the content
provider is an authorized content provider of the third party and preventing the
transmission of content to said user if said content provider is unauthorized,

9

Serial Number
09/636,393   PU050092

wherein said permitting step is performed by said third party". This claimed
element is neither disclosed nor suggested in Ben-Shaul.

Specifically, Ben-Shaul describes situations of the authorization of a client,
not a content provider (see paragraph 426 of Ben-Shaul). Specifically, Ben Shaul
states at paragraph 426

"It is possible, however, that the content provider permits downloading of
such content only after the user requesting the material has been authorized or
otherwise properly identified. For example, free software is typically given after a
proper form has been completed. In such a case the origin server 10 dynamically
links the authorized user, such as the client 14 to the downloaded material after
obtaining a registration or authorization. In this situation, it is normally
inappropriate for the origin server 10 to remotely cache such content. Yet, since
such entries are non-cacheable, the load on the origin server 10 and its latency
could increase significantly," (emphasis added)

Ben-Shaul discloses the complete opposite of what is claimed in Claim 1.
That is it is the content provider this authorized, versus whether a client is
authorized. This fundamental difference in the present invention and Ben-Shaul,
is readily apparent throughout the teachings of Ben-Shaul. Moreover, the
reference does not disclose or suggest what happens if a content provider is
authorized or unauthorized.

B. Rejection of Claim 2

Claim 2 claims a step of "further comprising the step of determining if the
content provider is authorized by the network operator to offer enhanced content
programming over the network, wherein said request for said content is
intercepted by said third party and rerouted by said third party to said authorized
content provider for said enhanced content programming if said user request was
directed to said unauthorized content provider."

Specifically, Ben-Shaul describes situations of the authorization of a client,
not a content provider (see paragraph 426 of Ben-Shaul). Specifically, Ben Shaul
states at paragraph 426

"It is possible, however, that the content provider permits downloading of
such content only after the user requesting the material has been authorized or
otherwise properly identified. For example, free software is typically given after a
proper form has been completed. In such a case the origin server 10 dynamically
links the authorized user, such as the client 14 to the downloaded material after
obtaining a registration or authorization. In this situation, it is normally

10

Serial Number
09/636,393   PU050092

inappropriate for the origin server 10 to remotely cache such content. Yet, since
such entries are non-cacheable, the load on the origin server 10 and its latency
could increase significantly," (emphasis added)

Ben-Shaul does not disclose the redirection of a request for content, if a
content provider is unauthorized, to an authorized content provider.

C. Rejection of Claim 4

The Examiner rejected Claim 4 by referring to paragraph 414 of Ben-Shaul.
Upon review of this paragraph, it appears that it discloses a method of how to
resolve a Domain Name Server request (or apparently how to resolve a Domain
Name to an IP address), see Figs. 14 and 16. This has nothing to do with
whether a content provider is authorized or not.

D. Rejection of Claim 7

The Examiner rejected Claim 7 by referred to paragraphs 22, 72, and 107
of Ben-Shaul. Specifically, the claim claims the elements of "intercepting a
request to finalize said supplemental user request" and "finalizing said
supplemental user request". There is nothing in these cited sections of Ben-Shaul
that would distinguish between these finalizing steps and what would be the
alternative, an intermediate step.

Paragraph 22 of Ben-Shaul discloses the operation of VPNs, firewalls, and
other types of architectures for network caching and security. Paragraph 72
discloses the redirection of a request for content to an edge server (which has
nothing to do with whether a content provider is authorized or not, but rather
based on basic principles of edge server technology). Paragraph 107 is control
parameters involving cookies. None of these disclosures of Ben-Shaul disclose
the elements of Claim 7.

E. Rejection of Claim 8

As amended, Claim 8 recites the elements of an authorized content
provider and an unauthorized content provider. As explained above, these
concepts are not present nor suggested in Ben-Shaul.

11

Serial Number
09/636,393   PU050092

F. Rejection of Claim 25

For reasons similar to what was argued for Claim 7, Ben-Shaul does not disclose operations for "finalizing", as claimed in Claim 25. That is, there is no distinguishing elements between a "final" type of operation versus an operation which is not "finalized" in Ben-Shaul, as suggested by the Examiner.

G. Rejection of Claim 28

As amended, such a claim introduces the concept of an authorized and unauthorized content provider. See Claims 1 and 8 above.

H. Rejection of Claim 42

As amended, such a claim introduces the concept of an authorized and unauthorized content provider. See Claims 1 and 8 above.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6809, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Applicants request that any fees owed in connection with this action be charged to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

/Joel M. Fogelson/
By: Joel M. Fogelson
      Reg. No. 43, 613
      Phone (609) 734-6809

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
Two Independence Way

12

Serial Number
09/636,393   PU050092

P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
June 27, 2007

13